

Gert Sibande District Municipality

2015/16 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

June 2016



*“A District Municipality Striving to Excel in Good Governance and
Quality Infrastructure”*

Table of Contents

1. Purpose	3
Executive Summary.....	4
2. Departmental Performance	5
2.1 Office of the Municipal Manager	6
2.2 Budget and Treasury	7
3.3 Corporate Services	8
3.4 Community and Social Services	9
3.5 Human Settlements	10
3.6 Infrastructure and Technical Services	11
3.7 Planning and Economic Development	12
4 Limitations of Evaluation	13

Annexures:

Annexure A: 2015/16 IDP Scorecard

Annexure B: Office of the Municipal Manager KPI Input Scorecard

Annexure C: Budget and Treasury KPI Input Scorecard

Annexure D: Corporate Services KPI Input Scorecard

Annexure E: Community and Social Services KPI Input Scorecard

Annexure F: Human Settlements KPI Input Scorecard

Annexure G: Infrastructure and Technical Services KPI Input Scorecard

Annexure H: Planning and Economic Development KPI Scorecard

Annexure I: Annual evaluation/status of procurement of Infrastructure Projects

1. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to give feedback regarding the performance of Gert Sibande District Municipality as required through The Municipal Systems Act No 32 of 2000 and Municipal Finance Management Act No 52 of 2003. The information included in this report is based on the IDP¹ and SDBIP² as developed for the financial year 2015/16. The scorecards were developed to reflect **cumulative performance**, therefore the status of indicators are a reflection of the overall performance level achieved year to date. This report is based on information received from each department for assessment of performance ending June 2016. This is a high-level report based on scores obtained through a process whereby actual information per Key Performance Area (KPA), strategic objective, programme and the aligned Key Performance Indicators and projects are compared to the budget and initial planning included in the 2015/16 Integrated Development Plan.

Overall performance for Gert Sibande District Municipality is based on the Departmental Performance Scorecard which is inclusive of all the IDP, SDBIP, TAS and General indicators. Sub-sections are included that discuss the progress made in achieving the targets as detailed in each scorecard in terms of the contribution made by each Department.

This report serves as a summary of results. The detail pertaining to the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and projects are included in a separate addendum document, due to the volume thereof. Results are presented in the form of scores as detailed below and were calculated using an automated system and based on the guidelines contained in the DPLG Regulation 805; Municipal Performance Regulations for Municipal Managers and Managers Directly Accountable to Municipal Managers, 2006. The scoring method utilised is as follows;

Rating	Colour code	Scoring	% Target achieved	
		Score	Low	High
Unsatisfactory		1-1.99	0.0%	66%
Below average		2 -2.99	66.6%	99.9%
Achieved target		3 -3.99	100%	132%
Achieved/ exceeded target		4 -4.99	133%	166.9%
Outstanding		5+	167.0%	+
NA – Not applicable for reporting in reporting period (excluded from performance measurement)				
OW – Set to zero weighting (excluded from performance measurement) by the Department				

¹ Integrated Development Plan

² Service Delivery and Budget Implementation Plan

Executive Summary

This report serves as the 2015/16 Annual Performance Report for the financial year ending June 2016. It provides feedback on the performance level achieved to date against the targets as laid out in the IDP and SDBIP.

The overall performance for Gert Sibande District Municipality is based on the Departmental Performance Scorecard as this contains all of the indicators as included in the IDP, SDBIP and General Scorecards. At the end of the financial year, the overall accumulative performance level was below target with an overall score of **2.82 (Compared to prior year score of 2.85)**. A total of 293 KPI's encompassing the different scorecards contribute to the overall organisational score, 36 KPI's where zero weighted (excluded from performance measurement) and therefore do not carry a score. Of the remaining 257 KPI's, hundred-and-sixty-one (63%) achieved or exceeded target, ninety-six (37%) were below target. A summary of performance by scorecard is provided as per the table below;

Gert Sibande District Municipality	Sept '15	Dec '15	Mar '16	June '16
	Score	Score	Score	Score
Overall	2.90	2.69	2.80	2.82
IDP	2.49	2.57	2.88	2.66
SDBIP	2.97	2.72	2.77	2.84

Table: Overall Performance

The **IDP Scorecard** achieved a below target score of **2.66 (Compared to prior year score of 2.65)**. A total of 65 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which 9 were zero weighted, thus having no impact on the overall IDP score. Of the remaining 56 indicators, thirty-one (55%) achieved or exceeded target, and twenty-five (45%) were below target.

The **SDBIP Scorecard** achieved a below target score of **2.84 (Compared to prior year score of 2.90)**. A total of 228 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which 27 were zero weighted, thus having no impact on the overall SDBIP score. Of the remaining 201 indicators, hundred-and-thirty (65%) achieved or exceeded target, and seventy-one (35%) were below target.

2. Departmental Performance

The Departmental Performance Scorecard constitutes all of the KPI's and projects as contained in the IDP and SDBIP Scorecards. This section of the report provides information on the contribution made by each Department to the performance levels achieved for the different scorecards which in turn represents the overall³ performance level achieved by the Municipality. Gert Sibande District Municipality completed the 2015/16 financial year with an overall score of **2.82**. A summary of the overall performance level achieved by each Department is provided in the table below;

Departmental Performance Overall Scores	Sep '15	Dec '15	Mar '16	June '16
	Score	Score	Score	Score
Overall	2.90	2.69	2.80	2.82
Office of the Municipal Manager	3.09	2.86	2.65	3.00
Budget and Treasury	2.93	3.05	3.27	3.21
Corporate Services	2.89	2.59	2.86	2.88
Community and Social Services	3.49	3.21	3.13	3.31
Human Settlements	2.51	1.86	1.82	1.79
Infrastructure and Technical Services	2.13	2.19	2.31	2.10
Planning and Economic Development	2.88	2.56	3.01	2.97

Table: Departmental Performance Overall Scores

The following summary sheets contain a breakdown of the Departmental performance.

³ Overall performance is calculated by taking an average of ALL of the KPI and project scores applicable to GSDM
Overall departmental scores are calculated by taking an average of ALL of the KPI and project scores applicable to that department

2.1 Office of the Municipal Manager

The Office of the Municipal Manager is responsible for a total of 34 KPI's which contribute to the overall performance level for the IDP and SDBIP Scorecards. The statistics for the Department were as follows;

Key Performance Indicators						
Scorecard	Total KPIs	Applicable for Reporting:	Reporting Purposes Only	Set to zero weighting	Target Achieved	Under Target
IDP	11	11	-	0	6	5
SDBIP	23	23	-	0	16	7

The Department ended the financial year achieving target with an overall score of **3.00** (Compared to prior year score of **3.00**). A summary of performance by Key Performance Area is provided below;

Departmental Performance Office of the Municipal Manager	Sep'15	Dec'15	Mar'16	June'16
	Score	Score	Score	Score
Overall Performance	3.09	2.86	2.65	3.00
KPA 1: Municipal Transformation and Institutional Transformation	3.00	2.72	2.30	2.64
KPA 4: Municipal Financial Viability and Management	3.48	2.57	2.60	2.93
KPA 5: Intergovernmental Relations, Good Governance and Public Participation	3.07	3.05	2.95	3.03
KPA 6: Spatial Rationale	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.00

Table: Summary Performance – Office of the Municipal Manager

The **IDP Scorecard** achieved a below target score of **2.67** (Compared to a prior year score of **3.10**). A total of 11 KPI's contribute to this scorecard. No KPI's were zero weighted. Of the 11 KPI's, six (55%) achieved or exceeded target, and five (45%) were below target.

The **SDBIP Scorecard** achieved target with a score of **3.02** (Compared to a prior year score of **2.96**). A total of 23 KPI's contribute to this scorecard. No KPI's were zero weighted. Of the 23 KPI's, sixteen (70%) achieved or exceeded target, and seven (30%) were below target.

2.2 Budget and Treasury

The Budget and Treasury Department is responsible for a total of 42 KPI's which contribute to the overall performance level for the IDP and SDBIP Scorecards. The statistics for the Department were as follows;

Key Performance Indicators						
Scorecard	Total KPIs	Applicable for Reporting:	Reporting Purposes Only	Set to zero weighting	Target Achieved	Under Target
IDP	6	3	-	3	3	0
SDBIP	36	35		1	26	9

The Department ended the financial year exceeding target with an overall score of **3.21** (Compared to a prior year score of **3.19**). A summary of performance by Key Performance Area is provided below;

Departmental Performance	Sep'15	Dec'15	Mar'16	June'16
Budget and Treasury	Score	Score	Score	Score
Overall Performance	2.93	3.05	3.27	3.21
KPA 4: Municipal Financial Viability and Management	2.83	3.00	3.23	3.18
KPA 5: Intergovernmental Relations, Good Governance and Public Participation	3.67	3.50	3.67	3.39

Table: Summary Performance –Budget and Treasury

The **IDP Scorecard** exceeded target with a score of **3.64** (Compared to a prior year score of **3.00**). A total of 6 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which 3 were zero weighted. The remaining 3 KPI's achieved or exceeded target.

The **SDBIP Scorecard** exceeded target with a score of **3.18** (Compared to a prior year score of **3.21**). A total of 36 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which 1 were zero weighted. Of the remaining 35 KPI's, twenty-six (74%) achieved or exceeded target, and nine (26%) were below target.

3.3 Corporate Services

The Corporate Services Department is responsible for a total of 51 KPI's which contribute to the overall performance level for the IDP and SDBIP Scorecards. The statistics for the Department were as follows;

Key Performance Indicators						
Scorecard	Total KPIs	Applicable for Reporting	Reporting Purposes Only	Set to zero weighting	Target Achieved	Under Target
IDP	10	8	-	2	5	3
SDBIP	41	41	-	0	24	17

The Department ended the financial year below target with an overall score of **2.88** (Compared to a prior year score of **2.32**). A summary of performance by Key Performance Area is provided below;

Departmental Performance Corporate Services	Sep'15	Dec'15	Mar'16	June'16
Overall Performance	2.89	2.59	2.86	2.88
KPA 1: Municipal Transformation and Institutional Transformation	2.63	2.33	2.74	2.82
KPA 4: Municipal Financial Viability and Management	4.04	2.75	2.28	2.76
KPA 5: Intergovernmental Relations, Good Governance and Public Participation	3.25	3.14	3.18	3.00

Table: Summary Performance –Corporate Services

The **IDP Scorecard** exceeded target with a score of **3.21** (Compared to a prior year score of **2.57**). A total of 10 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which 2 were zero weighted. Of the remaining 8 KPI's, five (63%) achieved or exceeded target, and three (37%) were below target.

The **SDBIP Scorecard** achieved a below target score of **2.82** (Compared to a prior year score of **2.28**). A total of 41 KPI's contribute to this scorecard. No KPI's were zero weighted. Of the 41 KPI's, twenty-four (59%) achieved or exceeded target, and seventeen (41%) were below target.

3.4 Community and Social Services

The Community and Social Services Department is responsible for a total of 54 KPI's which contribute to the overall performance level for IDP and SDBIP Scorecards. The statistics for the Department were as follows;

Key Performance Indicators						
Scorecard	Total KPIs	Applicable for Reporting	Reporting Purposes Only	Set to zero weighting	Target Achieved	Under Target
IDP	11	10	-	1	7	3
SDBIP	43	33	-	10	29	4

The Department ended the financial year exceeding target with an overall score of **3.31 (Compared to a prior year score of 3.47)**. A summary of performance by Key Performance Area is provided below;

Departmental Performance Community and Social Services	Sep'15	Dec'15	Mar'16	June'16
	Score	Score	Score	Score
Overall Performance	3.49	3.21	3.13	3.31
KPA 2: Basic Service Delivery	3.54	3.27	3.10	3.29
KPA 4: Municipal Financial Viability and Management	3.22	2.33	2.41	2.93
KPA 5: Intergovernmental Relations, Good Governance and Public Participation	3.44	3.22	3.39	3.47

Table: Summary Performance – Community and Social Services

The **IDP Scorecard** achieved a below target score of **2.63 (Compared to a prior year score of 3.13)**. A total of 11 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which 1 were zero weighted. Of the remaining 10 KPI's, seven (70%) achieved or exceeded target, and three (30%) were below target.

The **SDBIP Scorecard** exceeded target with a score of **3.51 (Compared to a prior year score of 3.57)**. A total of 43 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which 10 were zero weighted. Of the remaining 33 KPI's, twenty-nine (88%) achieved or exceeded target, and four (12%) were below target.

3.5 Human Settlements

The Human Settlements Department is responsible for a total of 28 KPI's which contribute to the overall performance level for IDP and SDBIP Scorecards. The statistics for the Department were as follows;

Key Performance Indicators						
Scorecard	Total KPIs	Applicable for Reporting	Reporting Purposes Only	Set to zero weighting	Target Achieved	Under Target
IDP	6	5	-	1	1	4
SDBIP	22	20	-	2	6	14

The Department ended the financial year below target with an overall score of **1.79** (Compared to a prior year score of **2.14**). A summary of performance by Key Performance Area is provided below;

Departmental Performance Human Settlements	Sep'15	Dec'15	Mar'16	June'16
Overall Performance	2.51	1.86	1.82	1.79
KPA 2: Basic Service Delivery	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
KPA 4: Municipal Financial Viability and Management	1.89	1.94	3.24	3.34
KPA 5: Intergovernmental Relations, Good Governance and Public Participation	3.00	1.93	1.71	1.64
KPA 6: Spatial Rationale	N/A	2.78	2.18	2.01

Table: Summary Performance –Human Settlements

The **IDP Scorecard** achieved a below target score of **1.86** (Compared to a prior year score of **1.00**). A total of 6 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which 1 were zero weighted. Of the remaining 5 KPI's, one (20%) achieved or exceeded target, and four (80%) were below target.

The **SDBIP Scorecard** achieved a below target score of **1.77** (Compared to a prior year score of **2.65**). A total of 22 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which 2 were zero weighted. Of the remaining 20 KPI's, six (30%) achieved or exceeded target, and fourteen (70%) were below target.

3.6 Infrastructure and Technical Services

The Infrastructure and Technical Services Department is responsible for a total of 40 KPI's which contribute to the overall performance level for the General, IDP and SDBIP Scorecards. The statistics for the Department were as follows;

Key Performance Indicators						
Scorecard	Total KPIs	Applicable for Reporting	Reporting Purposes Only	Set to zero weighting	Target Achieved	Under Target
IDP	14	12	-	2	3	9
SDBIP	26	23	-	3	8	15

The Department ended the financial year below target with an overall score of **2.10** (Compared to a prior year score of **2.41**). A summary of performance by Key Performance Area is provided below;

Departmental Performance Infrastructure and Technical Services	Sep'15	Dec'15	Mar'16	June'16
	Score	Score	Score	Score
Overall Performance	2.13	2.19	2.31	2.10
KPA 2: Basic Service Delivery	1.79	1.90	1.97	1.81
KPA 4: Municipal Financial Viability and Management	2.11	2.35	3.49	2.88
KPA 5: Intergovernmental Relations, Good Governance and Public Participation	3.00	2.25	2.00	2.25
KPA 6: Spatial Rationale	2.50	2.78	2.02	2.01

Table: Summary Performance –Infrastructure and Technical Services

The **IDP Scorecard** achieved a below target score of **2.04** (Compared to a prior year score of **1.60**). A total of 14 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which 2 were zero weighted. Of the remaining 12 KPI's, three (25%) achieved or exceeded target, and nine (75%) were below target.

The **SDBIP Scorecard** achieved a below target score of **2.12** (Compared to a prior year score of **2.82**). A total of 26 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which 3 were zero weighted. Of the remaining 23 KPI's, eight (35%) achieved or exceeded target, and fifteen (65%) were below target.

3.7 Planning and Economic Development

The Planning and Economic Development Department is responsible for a total of 44 KPI's which contribute to the overall performance level for the IDP and SDBIP Scorecards. The statistics for the Department were as follows;

Key Performance Indicators						
Scorecard	Total KPIs	Applicable for Reporting	Reporting Purposes Only	Set to zero weighting	Target Achieved	Under Target
IDP	7	7	-	0	6	1
SDBIP	37	26	-	11	21	5

The Department ended the financial year below target with an overall score of **2.97** (Compared to a prior year score of **3.04**). A summary of performance by Key Performance Area is provided below;

Departmental Performance Planning and Economic Development	Sep'15	Dec'15	Mar'16	June'16
	Score	Score	Score	Score
Overall Performance	2.88	2.56	3.01	2.97
KPA 3: Local Economic Development	2.00	2.44	2.73	2.67
KPA 4: Municipal Financial Viability and Management	4.14	2.61	2.94	2.96
KPA 5: Intergovernmental Relations, Good Governance and Public Participation	3.22	3.06	3.22	3.40
KPA 6: Spatial Rationale	2.45	2.17	3.09	2.86

Table: Summary Performance –Planning and Economic Development

The **IDP Scorecard** achieved target with a score of **3.30** (Compared to a prior year score of **3.57**). A total of 7 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which none were zero weighted. Of the 7 KPI's, six (86%) achieved or exceeded target, and one (14%) were below target.

The **SDBIP Scorecard** achieved a below target score of **2.89** (Compared to a prior year score of **2.90**). A total of 37 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which 11 were zero weighted. Of the remaining 26 KPI's, twenty-one (81%) achieved or exceeded target, and five (19%) were below target.

4 Limitations of Evaluation

1. The analysis contained in this report was based on information received until June 2016. Where no information was supplied, a 1.00 score was attached.
2. The automated system designed for Gert Sibande District Municipality's Performance Management System requirements was used to capture and calculate scores. Any errors made in terms of incorrect data, formats or capturing into incorrect fields will have a direct impact on the final scores.
3. All budget related data must be verified against the Municipal Financial System. Values input into the Performance Management System should be cumulative expenditure figures to give a true reflection of the actual performance.
4. Achievements reported in this document reflect the input received from the respective departments.
5. The scorecard remain the responsibility of the respective KPI owners and in no way does the PMS Unit accept responsibility for the adequacy and relevance of KPI Instructions and POE. The PMS Unit's functions are limited to coordination of the compilation of the Annual Performance Report and to calculate overall scores achieved in line with the approved rating scale applied by GSDM.